

REMARKS

The Office Action and cited references have been considered. Claims 1-7, 9-10, and 12-17 are pending in the present application. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Before proceeding to the merits of the Action, Applicant respectfully requests that the finality of the Action be withdrawn as being premature. Specifically, in the first action, claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Skog in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,517 ("Naim"). Yet in the final office action, claim 15 is now rejected in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0154400 ("Pirttimaa"). Although the independent claim changed, the limitations specifically recited in claim 15 did not. Therefore, there was no amendment to claim 15 that could have necessitated the changed from an assertion that the limitations of claim 15 were found in Naim, to the current assertion that they are found in Pirttimaa. Accordingly, the finality of the latest Action is premature and should be withdrawn.

Claims Objections

Claim 1 stands objected to because of a number of listed informalities. Applicants note these objections and have amended claim in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration of this objection.

Objection to the Drawings

On November 20, 2009, Applicant submitted new drawings in response to the objection. Withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-12, 14, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,977,917 ("Skog") in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0136398 ("Enzmann"). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Skog in view of Enzmann, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,155,526 ("Chaudhary"). Claims 6, 13, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Skog in view of Enzmann and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0154400 ("Pirttimaa"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 recites a method for transparent access authentication of subscribers connected to an authenticating network domain by a General Packet Radio Service GPRS core network or an Universal Mobile Telecommunication System UMTS network. The method comprises receiving a context creation request from a subscriber, assigning an IP address to the context creation request, receiving a check-in ID from the subscriber, receiving a private identification PrivID from the subscriber, the PrivID being correlated with a pre-recorded ID of the subscriber and stored together in a subscriber database, comparing the check-in ID with the pre-recorded ID, authenticating the subscriber when the check-in ID matches the pre-recorded ID, providing a routing module (7) as a standard entry point for all messages and deciding, in the routing module (7), by evaluation of the PrivID, which network node will handle the message, wherein when a protocol other than Session Initiated Protocol SIP is found, the

message is routed to a proxy server. This is not taught, disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Action sets forth a number of assumptions when comparing the claim to Skog that are not correct. For example, the Action assumes that the limitation in claim 1 “assigning an IP address to the context creation request” corresponds with “mapping an IP Address and a MSISDN” in Skog. However, Applicant respectfully submits that a MSISDN has nothing to do with assigning an IP address to a context creation request.

The Action further assumes that regarding the limitation “receiving a check-in ID from the subscriber”, the MSISN corresponds with the check-in ID. Thus, according to the Action, the MSISDN ***simultaneously*** corresponds with Applicant’s claimed context creation request and to a check-in ID.

Further, the Action assumes that the “private identification PrivID” also corresponds with the IP address and a pre-recorded ID correspond with the MSISDN.

In summary, the Action suggests that the IP address of Skog substitutes for two parameters of the claimed invention (IP address and PrivID), and the MSISN substitutes for three claimed parameters (context creation request, check-in ID, and pre-recorded ID). Applicant respectfully submits that this strained reading of Skog is improper, and is not how one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the cited patent.

Additionally, the Office admits that Skog does not disclose a routing module provided as a standard entry point of all messages, wherein the routing module

decides by evaluation of the PrivID which network node will handle the message, wherein when a protocol other than Session Initiated Protocol SIP is found, the message is routed to a proxy server. The Office cites Enzmann as allegedly teaching this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In Enzmann, depending on the type of data incoming to the router, the router determines to which item in the home network conversion interface the data should be sent. Para. [0048]. There is nothing in Enzmann, or Skog, that would have suggested to one of ordinary skill that the PrivID is the data that should be evaluated. Moreover, nothing in Enzmann teaches or suggests that when a Session Initiated Protocol SIP is found, the message is routed to a proxy server. A search of Skog found no occurrence of the term "proxy". There is no test taught by Enzmann that would determine if the protocol is SIP as required by claim 1.

Thus, even assuming for the sake of argument only, that one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to combine the teachings of Skog and Enzmann, the result would not have been Applicant's claimed invention.

Accordingly, and at least for these reasons, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the prior art of record, whether taken alone or in combination as proposed in the Office Action. Claims 2, 6-7, 13, and 15 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 1 and features recited therein. Therefore, withdrawn of the rejection of claims 2, 6-8, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-7, 9-10, and 12-17 are patentable over the prior art of record whether taken alone or in combination as proposed in the Office Action. If the rejections are maintained, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned to discuss how to best proceed to advance prosecution.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of record. Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and early notice to this effect is most earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-628-5197.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /Ronni S. Jillions/
Ronni S. Jillions
Registration No. 31,979

RSJ:me
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\R\rieb\blicker1\Pto\2010-01-20Amendment.doc